UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,534	10/17/2003	Peter Yong	T-4328	2131

42556 7590 07/21/2005

CHARLES H. THOMAS
CISLO & THOMAS LLP
4201 LONG BEACH BLVD
SUITE 405
LONG BEACH, CA 90807-2022

EXAMINER	
LAVARIAS, ARNEL C	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2872	

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

HD

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/688,534	YONG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Arnel C. Lavarias	2872	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *5/17/05,10/17/03*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *19-29* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *17 October 2003* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/17/03*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of Invention I, Claims 1-18, in the reply filed on 5/17/05 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

2. Claims 19-29 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 5/17/05.

Priority

3. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. Document 'EP 0 608 035', listed in the 'Foreign Patent Documents' section of PTO-1449 has been lined through, as a legible copy of the document, or the portion of the document which caused it to be listed, was not provided.***Drawings***

5. The drawings were received on 10/17/03. These drawings are objected to for the following reason(s) as set forth below.

6. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "138" has been used to designate both a floor and a forward end slat

(See Pages 37-38 of Applicants' disclosure). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

7. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description:

Figures 9-13- Reference numeral 99

Figures 14-19- Reference numeral 96

Figure 20- Reference numeral 142.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required

corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

8. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within *the range of 50 to 150 words*. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. *It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.*

9. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Abstract is too long.

Abstract, line 2- delete 'is provided'.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

10. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification. Examples of such errors are provided below.

11. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Page 7, line 19- 'made' should read 'may'

Page 25, line 18- '253' should read '254'

Page 28, line 8- '268' should read '260'

Page 41, line 10- '110' should read '310'.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

12. Claims 7, 11, 16 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 7 recites the limitation "said thin mounting strip" in lines 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 11, line 3; Claim 16, line 5- 'narrows' should read 'narrow'

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 1-2, 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kappel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6144418) in view of Giulie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4444465).

Kappel et al. discloses a light shield (See Figures 1-5) for a video screen panel having front and rear surfaces with a video display screen on its front surface (See 16, 18 in Figure 1), wherein the light shield (See 12 in Figure 1) is formed as a structure

comprising a flat roof (See 22 in Figure 1) having mutually opposing front and rear edges and mutually opposing inboard (e.g. right side flap on 12 in Figure 1) and outboard (e.g. left side flap on 12 in Figure 1) side edges, an outboard side panel (See left side flap 20 in Figure 1) joined to the outboard side edge of the roof and in a deployed position extending downwardly from the roof alongside the video display screen (See Figure 2), a flat mounting strip (See rearward projecting strip of roof wall 22 in Figures 1, 3) extending from the rear edge of the roof rearwardly beyond the outboard side panel, and a thin fastening mechanism joining the mounting strip to the video screen at a location rearwardly from the video display screen (See 24a, 24b in Figures 1, 3). Giulie et al. further discloses an inboard side panel (See right side flap 20 in Figure 1) joined to the inboard side edge of the roof and in a deployed position extending downwardly from the roof alongside the video display screen (See Figure 2); the inboard and outboard side panels are mounted to the roof by an adjustable coupling mechanism that permits the inboard side panel to be moved to an outboard direction from the inboard side edge of the roof and the outboard side panel to be moved to an inboard direction from the outboard side edge of the roof, whereby separation between the inboard and the outboard side panels is selectively adjustable (See Figure 5; col. 3, lines 3-20); and the thin fastening mechanism is comprised of first and second fastening layers wherein the first fastening layer bears a multiplicity of minute flexible fabric hooks and the second fastening layer bears a looped pile, and the flexible fabric hooks are releasably interengagable with the looped pile, and one of the fastening layers is permanently attached to the mounting strip and the other of the fastening layers is adapted for permanent securement relative to the

video display screen (See 24a, 24b in Figures 1, 3; col. 2, lines 32-35). Kappel et al. lacks the light shield being collapsible wherein both the inboard and outboard side panels are foldable onto the roof in a collapsed condition. However, Giulie et al. teaches an adjustable shield (See 15, 17, 19 in Figures 1-2) for a CRT display (See for example 5 in Figure 1) to eliminate glare on the screen, wherein the adjustable shield includes a flat roof (See 15 in Figures 1-2), an outboard side panel (See 17 in Figures 1-2), and an inboard side panel (See 19 in Figures 1-2). Further, Giulie et al. teaches that both the outboard side panel and the inboard side panel are collapsible such that both the outboard and inboard side panels are foldable onto the roof in a collapsed condition (See 32 in Figures 1-2; col. 1, line 38-col. 2, line 10). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the light shield of Kappel et al. further be collapsible wherein both the inboard and outboard side panels are foldable onto the roof in a collapsed condition, as taught by Giulie et al., to allow for compact and convenient storage and shipping of the light shield when not in use.

15. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. as applied to Claims 1-2 above, and further in view of Tierney (U.S. Patent No. 4784468).

Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. discloses the invention as set forth above in Claims 1-2, except for the inboard and outboard side flaps having rear edges which are provided with soft rear edge liners. However, Tierney teaches a conventional display monitor shield assembly (See Figures 1-3, 5) for glare reduction, wherein the shield assembly includes a flat roof (See 64 in Figures 1-2), an outboard side panel (See 60 in

Figures 1-2), and an inboard side panel (See 59 in Figures 1-2). Further, Tierney teaches that both the outboard side panel and the inboard side panel include rear edges with soft rear edge liners (See 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24 in Figure 1; col. 2, line 64-col. 3, line 37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the light shield of Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. further have the inboard and outboard side flaps have rear edges which are provided with soft rear edge liners, as taught by Tierney, for the purpose of preventing movement of the light shield while the shield is deployed on the display panel.

16. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Nakamura (JP 61067841 A).

Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. discloses the invention as set forth above in Claim 1, except for the thin fastening mechanism comprising first and second flat fastening layers, wherein the first fastening layer is comprised of a material that exerts a force of magnetic attraction and the second fastening layer is comprised of a material attracted by magnetism, and one of the fastening layer is permanently attached to the mounting strip and the other of the fastening layers is adapted for permanent attachment to the video display screen panel rearwardly from the video display screen. However, Nakamura teaches that the use of magnetic attachment is well known and conventional in the art. In particular, Nakamura teaches the attachment of a lens hood onto an instrument (See Figures 1-2), wherein a magnet attached to a portion of the instrument magnetically couples to a magnetically attractive object on the hood such that magnetic attachment

occurs when the magnet is in close proximity or in contact with the magnetically attractive object. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the thin fastening mechanism of the light shield of Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. comprise first and second flat fastening layers, wherein the first fastening layer is comprised of a material that exerts a force of magnetic attraction and the second fastening layer is comprised of a material attracted by magnetism, and one of the fastening layer is permanently attached to the mounting strip and the other of the fastening layers is adapted for permanent attachment to the video display screen panel rearwardly from the video display screen, as taught by Nakamura, to allow for precise attachment, as well as quick removal of the light shield.

17. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Lin (U.S. Patent No. 5534863).

Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. discloses the invention as set forth above in Claim 1, except for the thin fastening mechanism comprising a flat, stiff reinforcing strip attached to the mounting strip, and a thin retaining clip defining a narrow slot therein extending the length of the mounting strip, and adapted for permanent attachment to the video display panel rearwardly from the video display screen. However, Lin teaches a conventional eye protecting mask (See for example Figures 2-3, 5) for use on a CRT display device, wherein the mask includes a flat, reinforcing strip (See 40 in Figure 3) attached to the mounting strip (See 12 in Figure 3), and a thin retaining clip defining a narrow slot therein extending the length of the mounting strip, and adapted for permanent

attachment to the video display panel rearwardly from the video display screen (See 30, 323 in Figure 3). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the thin fastening mechanism of the light shield of Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al., further include a flat, stiff reinforcing strip attached to the mounting strip, and a thin retaining clip defining a narrow slot therein extending the length of the mounting strip, and adapted for permanent attachment to the video display panel rearwardly from the video display screen, as taught by Lin, for the purpose of providing pivotable movement of the light shield, allowing for quick and easy placement and adjustment of the shield when in use.

18. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al.

Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. discloses the invention as set forth above in Claim 1, except for the thin fastening mechanism being a flat double sided adhesive strip. However, Giulie et al. additionally teaches that the adjustable shield for the CRT display may be attached by a flat double sided adhesive strip (See 34, 35, 37 in Figures 1-2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the thin fastening mechanism of the light shield of Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. be a flat double sided adhesive strip, as additionally taught by Giulie et al., to allow for easy placement and removal of the light shield.

19. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of von Gutfeld (U.S. Patent No. 6115238).

Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. discloses the invention as set forth above in Claims 1, except for the outboard side panel being provided with an outboard side panel extension, the panel and extension being joined in telescopic fashion. However, von Gutfeld teaches an apparatus (See Figures 1-2) for limiting the viewing angle of a display device, such as an LCD display of a portable computer, wherein the apparatus includes a flat roof (See 2A in Figures 1-2), an outboard side panel (See left panel 2B in Figures 1-2), and an inboard side panel (See right panel 2B in Figures 1-2). Additionally, von Gutfeld teaches that the roof, outboard side panel, and the inboard side panel may each include extension panels, such that the extension panels are joined with their respective panel in telescopic fashion (See Figures 6-7; col. 4, line 57-col.5, line 12). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the outboard side panel of the light shield of Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. be provided with an outboard side panel extension, the panel and extension being joined in telescopic fashion, as taught by von Gutfeld, to allow for greater glare reduction and adjustable viewing privacy by allowing for arbitrary length selection of the side panel.

20. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Takahashi (U.S. Patent No. 5069529).

Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. discloses the invention as set forth above in Claim 1, except for the mounting strip being joined to the rear edge of the roof by an interior mounting strip fold that terminates at spaced distances from the inboard and outboard

side edges of the roof, and narrow slits are defined between the roof and the fastening strip from the inboard and outboard side edges of the roof to the interior mounting strip fold. However, Takahashi teaches portable display equipment that includes an external light preventing member (See 2 in Figure 1; Figure 2A), wherein the light preventing member includes a roof (See 22c in Figure 2A), an inboard side panel (See 22b in Figure 2A), and an outboard side panel (See 22d in Figure 2A). Further, Takahashi teaches that the mounting surface (See 21a in Figure 2A) is joined to the rear edge of the roof by an interior mounting strip fold (See crease 22j in Figure 2A) that terminates at spaced distances from the inboard and outboard side edges of the roof, and narrow slits (See slits on either side of crease 22j in Figure 2A) are defined between the roof and the fastening strip from the inboard and outboard side edges of the roof to the interior mounting strip fold. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the mounting strip of the light shield of Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. be joined to the rear edge of the roof by an interior mounting strip fold that terminates at spaced distances from the inboard and outboard side edges of the roof, and narrow slits are defined between the roof and the fastening strip from the inboard and outboard side edges of the roof to the interior mounting strip fold, as taught by Takahashi, to simplify construction of the light shield by allowing for easier creasing and folding along the rear edge.

21. Claims 12-15, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. and Izawa (U.S. Patent No. 6542698).

Kappel et al. discloses a light shield (See Figures 1-5; 12 in Figure 1) formed as a structure comprising a flat roof (See 22 in Figure 1) having mutually opposing front and rear edges and mutually opposing inboard (e.g. right side flap on 12 in Figure 1) and outboard (e.g. left side flap on 12 in Figure 1) side edges, an outboard side panel (See left side flap 20 in Figure 1) joined to the outboard side edge of the roof and in a deployed position extending downwardly from the roof alongside the video display screen (See Figure 2), a flat mounting strip (See rearward projecting strip of roof wall 22 in Figures 1, 3) extending from the rear edge of the roof rearwardly beyond the outboard side panel, and a thin fastening mechanism joining the mounting strip to the video screen at a location rearwardly from the video display screen (See 24a, 24b in Figures 1, 3). Giulie et al. further discloses an inboard side panel (See right side flap 20 in Figure 1) joined to the inboard side edge of the roof and in a deployed position extending downwardly from the roof alongside the video display screen (See Figure 2); the inboard and outboard side panels are mounted to the roof by an adjustable coupling mechanism that permits the inboard side panel to be moved to an outboard direction from the inboard side edge of the roof and the outboard side panel to be moved to an inboard direction from the outboard side edge of the roof, whereby separation between the inboard and the outboard side panels is selectively adjustable (See Figure 5; col. 3, lines 3-20); the thin fastening mechanism is comprised of first and second fastening layers wherein the first fastening layer bears a multiplicity of minute flexible fabric hooks and the second fastening layer bears a looped pile, and the flexible fabric hooks are releasably interengagable with the looped pile, and one of the fastening layers is permanently attached to the mounting strip

and the other of the fastening layers is adapted for permanent securement relative to the video display screen (See 24a, 24b in Figures 1, 3; col. 2, lines 32-35); the video screen panel having an upper edge surface and the fastening mechanism being attached to the upper edge surface (See 24a, 24b in Figures 1-4); the video screen panel has a top edge surface and the rear edge of the roof resides in contact with the top edge surface (See Figures 2-3); and the light shield fabricated from plastic (See col. 2, lines 32-51). Kappel et al. lacks the light shield being collapsible wherein both the inboard and outboard side panels are foldable onto the roof in a collapsed condition and being in combination with a video camera having a camera body with a video screen panel cavity defined therein, a video screen panel having front and rear surfaces with a video display screen on the front surface, hinged to the camera body to fold into a stored position nested within the video screen panel cavity and alternatively foldable to a deployed position projecting out from the video screen panel cavity and laterally from the camera body. However, Giulie et al. teaches an adjustable shield (See 15, 17, 19 in Figures 1-2) for a CRT display (See for example 5 in Figure 1) to eliminate glare on the screen, wherein the adjustable shield includes a flat roof (See 15 in Figures 1-2), an outboard side panel (See 17 in Figures 1-2), and an inboard side panel (See 19 in Figures 1-2). Further, Giulie et al. teaches that both the outboard side panel and the inboard side panel are collapsible such that both the outboard and inboard side panels are foldable onto the roof in a collapsed condition (See 32 in Figures 1-2; col. 1, line 38-col. 2, line 10). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the light shield of Kappel et al. further be collapsible wherein both the inboard and outboard side panels

are foldable onto the roof in a collapsed condition, as taught by Giulie et al., to allow for compact and convenient storage and shipping of the light shield when not in use. The combined teachings of Kappel et al. and Giulie et al. lack the light shield in combination with a video camera. However, Izawa teaches a conventional shading hood for a digital camera having a liquid crystal display (See for example Figures 1-2), wherein the shading hood is attached to a camera body with a video screen panel cavity defined therein, a video screen panel having front and rear surfaces with a video display screen on the front surface, hinged to the camera body to fold into a stored position nested within the video screen panel cavity and alternatively foldable to a deployed position projecting out from the video screen panel cavity and laterally from the camera body (See Figure 2B). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the light shield of Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. further be in combination with a video camera having a camera body with a video screen panel cavity defined therein, a video screen panel having front and rear surfaces with a video display screen on the front surface, hinged to the camera body to fold into a stored position nested within the video screen panel cavity and alternatively foldable to a deployed position projecting out from the video screen panel cavity and laterally from the camera body, as taught by Iwaza, to reliably shade external incident light, while enabling multiple persons to simultaneously see a clear and sharp image on the LCD screen of the video camera.

22. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. and Iwaza as applied to Claim 12 above, and further in view of Takahashi.

Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. and Iwaza discloses the invention as set forth above in Claim 12, except for the mounting strip being joined to the rear edge of the roof by an interior mounting strip fold that terminates at spaced distances from the inboard and outboard side edges of the roof, and narrow slits are defined between the roof and the fastening strip from the inboard and outboard side edges of the roof to the interior mounting strip fold. However, Takahashi teaches portable display equipment that includes an external light preventing member (See 2 in Figure 1; Figure 2A), wherein the light preventing member includes a roof (See 22c in Figure 2A), an inboard side panel (See 22b in Figure 2A), and an outboard side panel (See 22d in Figure 2A). Further, Takahashi teaches that the mounting surface (See 21a in Figure 2A) is joined to the rear edge of the roof by an interior mounting strip fold (See crease 22j in Figure 2A) that terminates at spaced distances from the inboard and outboard side edges of the roof, and narrow slits (See slits on either side of crease 22j in Figure 2A) are defined between the roof and the fastening strip from the inboard and outboard side edges of the roof to the interior mounting strip fold. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the mounting strip of the light shield of Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. and Iwaza be joined to the rear edge of the roof by an interior mounting strip fold that terminates at spaced distances from the inboard and outboard side edges of the roof, and narrow slits are defined between the roof

and the fastening strip from the inboard and outboard side edges of the roof to the interior mounting strip fold, as taught by Takahashi, to simplify construction of the light shield by allowing for easier creasing and folding along the rear edge.

23. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. and Iwaza as applied to Claim 12 above, and further in view of Stroll, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5095385).

Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. and Iwaza discloses the invention as set forth above in Claim 12, except for the light shield being fabricated from stiff black paper. However, Stroll, Jr. teaches a glare guard for a computer terminal (See for example Figures 1-2), wherein the glare guard may be fabricated from various materials including plastic or cardboard, and the various panels may be painted black (See col. 4, lines 48-51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the light shield of Kappel et al. in view of Giulie et al. and Iwaza be fabricated from stiff black paper, as taught by Stroll, Jr., for the purpose of further reducing or preventing glare.

Conclusion

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arnel C. Lavarias whose telephone number is 571-272-2315. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30 AM - 6 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Drew Dunn can be reached on 571-272-2312. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Arnel C. Lavarias
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 2872
7/18/05